

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Charles Michael Stokes,)	C/A NO. 9:10-1535-CMC-BM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
Jon E. Ozmint, Director and Jimmy)	
Simmons, Chief.Designee Inmate)	
Grievance Branch,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On June 29, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on July 14, 2010.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is

made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Plaintiff's objections, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order. Plaintiff's objections are without merit. As noted by the Magistrate Judge, there is no inherent constitutional right to an effective prison grievance procedure. *Adams v. Rice*, 40 F.3d 72, 75 (4th Cir. 1994); *Antonelli v. Sheahan*, 81 F.3d 1422, 1430-31 (7th Cir. 1996).

This action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
July 19, 2010

C:\Documents and Settings\Guest\Local Settings\Temp\notesFFF692\10-1535 Stokes v. Omzint adopt rr dism wo prej wo svc.wpd